

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln. No. 09/680,283
Attorney Docket No.: Q60971

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-21 are all the claims pending in the application. By way of this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 11, and 17. In addition, Applicant cancels claim 5 and adds claims 19-21.

In the Advisory Action mailed April 14, 2005, the Examiner notes that the Request for Reconsideration filed on February 15, 2005 has been considered but does not overcome the rejection of record. In particular, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Zen et al. “Value-added Internet: a pragmatic TINA-based path to the Internet and PSTN Integration” Global Convergence of Telecommunications and Distributed Objected Computing Proceedings, November 17-20, 1997 (hereinafter “Zen”) in view of Manione et al., “A ‘TINA Light’ Service Architecture for the Internet-Telecom scenario,” Telecommunications Information Networking Architecture Conference Proceedings, April 12-15, 1999 (hereinafter “Manione”).

Specifically, the Examiner notes that the features argued in the Request for Reconsideration are not recited in the claims. In particular, the Examiner alleges that claim 1 does not recite “providing central authentication via a guided servlet entry”. In addition, the Examiner alleges that claim 1 does not require performing “those steps for accessing a service platform via an Internet browser session in sequence.” The Examiner further notes that there is no request being mentioned in claim 1, so it is unclear how and when an applet initiates re-request of service by initiating a re-contacting of the web-server (*see* Continuation Sheet of the Advisory Action dated April 14, 2005).

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln. No. 09/680,283
Attorney Docket No.: Q60971

In view thereof, Applicant amends claims 1, 11, and 17 to further clarify the invention.

For example, claim 1, as now amended, among a number of unique features recites:

if said certain browser session is not associated to said related service session, the servlet returning a web-page containing an applet to guide an associated browser of the user through a logon process for said related service session and after the logon process via the applet, the applet initiates a re-request to access the service session by initiating a re-contacting of said web server of the content provider...

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest at least these unique features of claim 1.

Zen teaches that the end user must download additional Java software in order to make his browser TINA capable. This software must be downloaded to incorporate a Java CORBA client for functional interaction (§ 2.1). That is, Zen teaches needing to install additional software on the browser and not simply having a servlet return an applet that will TINA enable the user browser. In addition, Zen fails to teach or suggest having the servlet detect whether or not certain browser session is associated to a related service session and if said certain browser session is not associated to said related service session, then have the servlet return a web-page containing an applet to guide an associated browser of the user through a logon process for said related service session, as set forth in claim 1.

Moreover, Manione does not cure the deficient teachings of Zen. Manione fails to teach or suggest how the Java service object could use the session information. That is, Manione does not teach or suggest providing central authentication via a guided servlet entry, *i.e.*, having a

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln. No. 09/680,283
Attorney Docket No.: Q60971

servlet return an applet to the browser of the user for a logon process. In other words, Manione fails to teach or suggest using the static UAPs to return a web-page containing an applet that guides an associated browser of the user through a logon process for said related service session.

In summary, the combined teachings of Zen and Manione fail to teach or suggest having a servlet return a web-page containing an applet to guide an associated browser of the user through a logon process for said related service session. In addition, the combined teachings of Zen and Manione does not teach or suggest that after the logon process via the applet, the applet initiating a re-request to access the service session by initiating a re-contacting of said web server of the content provider.

In view of these clarified ambiguities, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-4, 6-10, and 18 are patentable over the combined teachings of Zen and Manione at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Independent claims 11 and 17 contain features that are similar to the features argued above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, arguments presented with respect to claim 1 are respectfully submitted to apply with equal force here. For at least analogous exemplary reasons, therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of independent claims 11 and 17. Claims 12-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 11.

Finally, in order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claims 19-21. Claims 19-21 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. In addition, claim 19 recites:

when said certain browser session is not associated to said related service session,

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln. No. 09/680,283
Attorney Docket No.: Q60971

the servlet of the content provider sends a web-page containing an applet to the browser of the user, wherein the sent applet guides the browser of the user through the logon process to a retailer, and wherein, after the logon process, informing the content provider of an established association between the browser of the user and the retailer.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Zen fails to teach or suggest a servlet sending an applet to the user browser, where the sent applet guides the browser of the user through the logon process to a retailer. Manione fails to cure the deficient teachings of Zen. Manione is an integrated approach, which combines the provider and the retailer to simplify the structure of TINA (*Abstract*). Accordingly, Manione's approach is for interacting between the user and the service platform, *i.e.*, the browser and the retailer. Manione does not teach or suggest having a servlet stored in the provider to serve as somewhat of a proxy for the user to interact with the retailer. That is, in Manione, the interaction is only between the user and the service domain because the provider and retailer are integrated. For at least this additional reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is patentable over the combined teachings of Zen and Manione.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln. No. 09/680,283
Attorney Docket No.: Q60971

Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dvorscen
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 11, 2005

Attorney Docket No.: Q60971